arXiv:1406.2557v1 [physics.optics] 10 Jun 2014

Comment on 'Simulating thick atmospheric turbulence in the lab with application to orbital angular momentum communication'

Jeffrey H Shapiro

Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA

E-mail: jhs@mit.edu

Abstract. Recently, Rodenburg *et al* (2014 New J. Phys. **16** 033020) presented an approach for simulating propagation over a long path of uniformly distributed Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence by means of a compact laboratory arrangement that used two carefully placed and controlled spatial light modulators. We show that their simulation approach mimics the behavior of plane-wave propagation, rather than general beam-wave propagation. Thus, the regime in which their orbital angular momentum (OAM) cross-talk results accurately represent the behavior to be expected in horizontal-path propagation through turbulence may be limited to collimated-beam OAM modes whose diameters are sufficient that turbulence-induced beam spread is negligible.

1. Introduction

The use of orbital angular momentum (OAM) beams in free-space optical (FSO) communication has attracted considerable interest of late, both for increasing the data rate of classical communications [1, 2] and the secret-key rate of quantum communications [3, 4]. Of course, such OAM FSO systems are subject to performance degradation arising from atmospheric turbulence, thus prompting work to understand the nature of that degradation [5, 6, 7], and how adaptive optics might mitigate it [8]. Almost exclusively, however, studies of turbulence effects on OAM propagation, such as [5, 6, 7, 8], have presumed thin, phase-screen turbulence in the vicinity of the receiver pupil. Consequently, these works do not properly characterize the effects that would be encountered in propagation over a long path of uniformly-distributed turbulence, i.e., thick turbulence. Recently, Rodenburg *et al* [9] presented an approach for simulating propagation over long path of uniformly distributed Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence by means of a compact laboratory arrangement that used two carefully placed and controlled spatial light modulators. We show that their simulation approach mimics the behavior of plane-wave propagation, rather than general beam-wave propagation. Thus, the regime in which their OAM cross-talk results accurately represent the behavior to be expected in horizontal-path propagation through turbulence may be limited to collimated-beam OAM modes whose diameters are sufficient that turbulence-induced beam spread is negligible.

We begin, in section 2, by showing how the extended Huygens-Fresnel principle [10] can be used to characterize the average cross-talk between OAM modes that have propagated through thick turbulence. Then, in section 3, we demonstrate that [9] may only capture that behavior when turbulence-induced beam spread can be neglected for their collimated-beam OAM modes [11]. There, we also show that this no beam-spread condition is barely satisfied by the simulation parameters they establish for 785-nm-wavelength light to propagate over a 1-km-long path through uniformly distributed $C_n^2 = 1.8 \times 10^{-14}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2/3}$ Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence from an 18.2-cm-diameter transmit pupil to an 18.2-cm-diameter receive pupil.

2. Cross-Talk Characterization via the Extended Huygens-Fresnel Principle

Let $\{\Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho})\}$, for $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (x, y)$, be the complex field envelopes for a set of wavelength-λ orthonormal OAM modes on the circular transmitter pupil $\mathcal{A}_0 = \{\boldsymbol{\rho} : |\boldsymbol{\rho}| \leq D/2\}$ in the $z = 0$ plane, where ℓ indexes their orbital angular momenta. Likewise, let $\{\psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}')\}$, for $\boldsymbol{\rho}' = (x', y')$, be a set of orthonormal OAM modes on the circular receiver pupil $\mathcal{A}_L = \{\boldsymbol{\rho}' : |\boldsymbol{\rho}'| \leq D/2\}$ in the $z = L$ plane that are extracted by a mode converter in that pupil. From the extended Huygens-Fresnel principle, we have that the complex field envelope, $\zeta_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}')$, of the field produced in the $z = L$ plane by transmission of $\Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho})$

from $\mathcal{A}_0$ is

$$\zeta_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}') = \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} d\boldsymbol{\rho}\, \Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}) h_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}', \boldsymbol{\rho}), \tag{1}$$

where $h_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}', \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is the atmospheric Green's function. The unnormalized average cross-talk between received OAM modes ℓ and ℓ' in the $\mathcal{A}_L$ pupil is therefore

$$C_{\ell,\ell'} \equiv \left\langle \left| \int_{\mathcal{A}_L} d\boldsymbol{\rho}'\, \psi^*_{\ell'}(\boldsymbol{\rho}') \zeta_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}') \right|^2 \right\rangle, \tag{2}$$

where angle brackets denote averaging over the turbulence ensemble. It follows that $C_{\ell,\ell'}$ is completely characterized by the mutual coherence function of the atmospheric Green's function, viz.,

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\ell,\ell'} = & \int_{\mathcal{A}_L} d\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 \int_{\mathcal{A}_L} d\boldsymbol{\rho}'_2 \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_2\, \psi_{\ell'}(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1) \psi^*_{\ell'}(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_2) \Psi^*_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1) \Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}_2) \\ & \times \langle h^*_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1, \boldsymbol{\rho}_1) h_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_2, \boldsymbol{\rho}_2) \rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

For Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence, we have that [10, 12, 13]

$$\langle h^*_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1, \boldsymbol{\rho}_1) h_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_2, \boldsymbol{\rho}_2) \rangle = \frac{e^{-ik(|\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_1|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\rho}'_2 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2|^2)/2L}}{(\lambda L)^2}\, e^{-D(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}'_2, \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2)/2}, \tag{4}$$

where $k = 2\pi/\lambda$ is the wave number, the fraction on the right is due to vacuum propagation, and

$$\begin{aligned} & D(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}'_2, \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2) \equiv \\ & \qquad 2.91 k^2 \int_0^L dz\, C_n^2(z) |(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}'_2) z/L + (\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2)(1 - z/L)|^{5/3}, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

is due to turbulence, whose strength profile along the path is $C_n^2(z)$. The initial derivation of this mutual coherence function employed the Rytov approximation [10, 12], hence $D(\boldsymbol{\rho}'_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}'_2, \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2)$ was termed the two-source, spherical-wave, wave structure function, and the validity of (4) and (5) was limited to the weak-perturbation regime before the onset of saturated scintillation. Later [13], it was shown that (4) and (5) could be obtained from the small-angle approximation to the linear transport equation, making them valid well into saturated scintillation.

Several key points are worth noting here. First, non-uniform turbulence distributions lead to there being several coherence lengths of potential interest, including: (a) the transmitter-pupil coherence length

$$\rho_0 \equiv \left(2.91 k^2 \int_0^L dz\, C_n^2(z) (1 - z/L)^{5/3} \right)^{-3/5}, \tag{6}$$

which quantifies the beam spread incurred in propagation from $z = 0$ to $z = L$, because transmission of a complex field envelope $E_0(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ from $\mathcal{A}_0$ yields a complex field envelope $E_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}')$ in $\mathcal{A}_L$ whose average irradiance is

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle |E_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}')|^2 \rangle = \\ & \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 \int_{\mathcal{A}_0} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_2\, E^*_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1) E_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}_2) \frac{e^{-ik(|\boldsymbol{\rho}' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_1|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\rho}' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2|^2)/2L}}{(\lambda L)^2}\, e^{-(|\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2|/\rho_0)^{5/3}/2}; \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

and (b), the receiver-pupil coherence length

$$\rho_0' \equiv \left(2.91k^2 \int_0^L dz\, C_n^2(z)(z/L)^{5/3} \right)^{-3/5}, \tag{8}$$

which quantifies the angle-of-arrival spread for a point-source transmission $E_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \delta(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ from $\mathcal{A}_0$, because a diffraction-limited, focal-length $f > 0$ lens in $\mathcal{A}_L$ yields an average image-plane irradiance

$$\langle |E_{L'}(\boldsymbol{\rho})|^2 \rangle = \int_{\mathcal{A}_L} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' \int_{\mathcal{A}_L} d\boldsymbol{\rho}_2' \, \frac{e^{ik\boldsymbol{\rho}\cdot(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2')/L'}}{(\lambda L)^2 (\lambda L')^2} \, e^{-(|\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2'|/\rho_0')^{5/3}/2}, \tag{9}$$

where $1/L' = 1/L - 1/f$. For a uniform distribution of turbulence—$C_n^2(z)$ constant from $z = 0$ to $z = L$—these two coherence lengths coincide,

$$\rho_0 = \rho_0' = (1.09k^2 C_n^2 L)^{-3/5}. \tag{10}$$

In addition to ρ_0 and ρ_0', there is one more coherence length we need to introduce. Suppose that a plane wave is transmitted from the $z = 0$ plane, i.e., $E_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = E_0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in that plane. The mutual coherence function of the resulting $z = L$ field, found from (4) and (5) with $\mathcal{A}_0$ extended to cover the entire $z = 0$ plane, obeys

$$\begin{aligned} &\langle E_L^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1) E_L(\boldsymbol{\rho}_2') \rangle = \\ &\quad \int d\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 \int d\boldsymbol{\rho}_2 \, |E_0|^2 \frac{e^{-ik(|\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_1|^2 - |\boldsymbol{\rho}_2' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2|^2)/2L}}{(\lambda L)^2} \, e^{-D(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2', \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2)/2} = \\ &\quad |E_0|^2 e^{-D(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2', \boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2')/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence, where the second equality follows from integrating in sum and difference coordinates, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_+ = (\boldsymbol{\rho}_1 + \boldsymbol{\rho}_2)/2$ and $\boldsymbol{\rho}_- = \boldsymbol{\rho}_1 - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2$. Note that

$$D(\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2', \boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2') = \left(2.91k^2 \int_0^L dz\, C_n^2(z) \right) |\boldsymbol{\rho}_1' - \boldsymbol{\rho}_2'|^{5/3}, \tag{12}$$

is the plane-wave structure function of the Rytov theory, whose coherence length is

$$\rho_P = \left(2.91k^2 \int_0^L dz\, C_n^2(z) \right)^{-3/5} \tag{13}$$

in general, and

$$\rho_P = (2.91k^2 C_n^2 L)^{-3/5} \tag{14}$$

for uniformly-distributed turbulence.

3. The Rodenburg *et al* Simulator

Rodenburg *et al* [9] performed a laboratory experiment scaled to simulate propagation of 785-nm-wavelength OAM modes over a 1-km-long path of uniformly distributed, Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence with $C_n^2 = 1.8{\times}10^{-14}\,\mathrm{m}^{-2/3}$. In what follows, however, we shall stick with the unscaled path geometry, rather than the scaled version Rodenburg *et al* used in their experiments.

In [9], the position and strength of the two phase screens were chosen to match the following propagation parameters for the propagation path specified above—the Fried parameter version of the plane-wave coherence length, $r_0 = (6.88)^{3/5}\rho_P$; the plane-wave log-amplitude variance, $\sigma_\chi^2 = 0.31k^{7/6}C_n^2L^{11/6}$; the normalized variance, σ_P^2, of the power collected by the 18.2-cm-diameter receiver pupil from a plane-wave transmission; and the density of branch points in that receiver pupil, ρ_{BP}—see [9] for the details. Rodenburg *et al* give r_0 values and locations for the two phase screens they claim will simulate propagation through the thick turbulent path described above: $r_{01} = 3.926\,\mathrm{cm}$, $r_{02} = 3.503\,\mathrm{cm}$, $z_1 = 171.7\,\mathrm{m}$, and $z_2 = 1.538\,\mathrm{m}$. To connect with the extended Huygens-Fresnel principle theory laid out in section 2, we note that Rodenburg *et al*'s phase screens correspond to the impulsive $C_n^2(z)$ distribution

$$C_n^2(z) = N_{n1}^2\delta(z - z_1) + N_{n2}^2\delta(z - z_2), \tag{15}$$

where

$$N_{nm}^2 = 6.88/2.91k^2r_{0m}^{5/3} = \begin{cases} 8.14 \times 10^{-12}\,\mathrm{m}^{-1/3}, & \text{for } m = 1 \\ 9.84 \times 10^{-12}\,\mathrm{m}^{-1/3}, & \text{for } m = 2. \end{cases} \tag{16}$$

At this point it is easy to see the limitation of the Rodenburg *et al* simulation. Their two-screen $C_n^2(z)$ distribution yields

$$\rho_0 = \left[2.91k^2\left(N_{n1}^2(1 - z_1/L)^{5/3} + N_{n2}^2(1 - z_2L)^{5/3}\right)\right]^{-3/5} = 8.3\,\mathrm{mm}, \tag{17}$$

and

$$\rho_0' = \left[2.91k^2\left(N_{n1}^2(z_1/L)^{5/3} + N_{n2}^2(z_2L)^{5/3}\right)\right]^{-3/5} = 7.19\,\mathrm{cm}, \tag{18}$$

for the transmit and receive pupil coherence lengths, whereas the uniformly-distributed turbulence they are trying to simulate would have

$$\rho_0 = \rho_0' = (1.09k^2C_n^2L)^{-3/5} = 1.38\,\mathrm{cm}. \tag{19}$$

Given the above coherence-length discrepancies, one cannot expect the Rodenburg *et al* simulator to yield accurate results for $C_{\ell,\ell'}$ for all choices of the OAM modes $\Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. The question then becomes when could it provide an accurate cross-talk assessment? Because the Rodenburg *et al* simulator matched propagation parameters for a plane-wave source, it is reasonable to suggest collimated-beam OAM modes as the natural candidates for accurate $C_{\ell,\ell'}$ determination via that simulator. Indeed, although [9] does not say so, the cross-talk results reported therein were obtained with precisely such modes [11], i.e.,

$$\Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sqrt{\frac{4}{\pi D^2}}\,e^{i\ell\phi}, \text{ for } |\boldsymbol{\rho}| \le D/2, \tag{20}$$

where ϕ is the azimuthal angle of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$.

Because the $D \to \infty$ limit of (20) is an OAM-modulated plane wave, we can expect that the $C_{\ell,\ell'}$ results from [9] should be accurate when D is large enough that turbulence-induced beam spread can be ignored. For a simple and optimisitic initial

assessment of whether beam spread is insignificant in the [9] scenario, we will replace its 18.2-cm-diameter circular pupils with square pupils having 18.2 cm sides and calculate

$$\mathcal{F}_0 \equiv \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} dx' \int_{-D/2}^{D/2} dy' \, \langle |\zeta_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}')|^2 \rangle \tag{21}$$

for

$$\Psi_0(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{1}{D}, \text{ for } |x|, |y| \le D/2 \tag{22}$$

when $\rho_0 = 3.8\,\text{mm}$ (the $z = 0$ plane coherence length for the Rodenburg *et al* simulator), and compare that result with the corresponding vacuum-propagation ($\rho_0 = \infty$) result. After some algebra we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_0 = & \int_{-1}^{1} dv_x \int_{-1}^{1} dv_y \, \frac{\sin[\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_x(1-|v_x|)]}{\pi v_x} \, \frac{\sin[\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_y(1-|v_y|)]}{\pi v_y} \\ & \times \frac{\sin[\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_x]}{\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_x} \, \frac{\sin[\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_y]}{\pi\sqrt{D_f}\, v_y} \, e^{-(\sqrt{v_x^2+v_y^2}\, D/\rho_0)^{5/3}/2}, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $D_f = D^4/(\lambda L)^2$ is the Fresnel-number product of the transmitter-receiver geometry. Equation (23) yields $F_0 = 0.929$ for vacuum propagation and $F_0 = 0.719$ for the turbulent case. Inasmuch as Rodenburg *et al*'s circular pupils inscribe our square pupils, and

$$\Psi_\ell(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{e^{i\ell\phi}}{D}, \text{ for } |x|, |y| \le D/2 \tag{24}$$

with $\ell \neq 0$ has higher spatial-frequency content than does $\Psi_0(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, we believe that the results from [9] are on the edge of providing an accurate cross-talk assessment. A more definitive statement about the validity of [9] would require full comparison between its experimental results and numerical evaluation of (2), using (4) and (5) with the parameter values for the horizontal-path scenario [9] chose to simulate.

Conclusions

We have shown that the two-screen turbulence simulator from [9] does not properly represent the Green's-function mutual coherence for a uniform distribution of Kolmogorov-spectrum turbulence. As a result, the average cross-talk predictions from [9] for reception without adaptive optics—predictions that can be directly compared with those obtained from the extended Huygens-Fresnel principle—may only be valid for that paper's collimated-beam OAM modes when turbulence-induced beam spread is insignificant. Moreover, if the results for cross-talk without adaptive optics are suspect, then those obtained for cross-talk mitigation with adaptive optics must also be regarded with skepticism.

References

[1] Gibson G, Courtial J, Padgett M J, Vasnetsov M, Pas'ko V, Barnett S M, Franke-Arnold S 2004 *Opt. Express* **12** 5448

[2] Wang J, Yang J-Y, Fazal I M, Ahmed N, Yan Y, Huang H, Ren Y, Yue Y, Dolinar S, Tur M, Willner A E 2012 *Nature Photon.* **6** 488
[3] Malik M, O'Sullivan M, Rodenburg B, Mirhosseini M, Leach J, Lavery M P J, Padgett M J, Boyd R W 2012 *Opt. Express* **20** 13195
[4] Leach J, Bolduc E, Gauthier D J, Boyd R W 2012 *Phys. Rev. A* **85** 060304(R)
[5] Paterson C 2005 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94** 153901
[6] Rodenburg B, Lavery M P J, Malik M, O'Sullivan M N, Mirhosseini M, Robertson D J, Padgett M, Boyd R W 2012 *Opt. Lett.* **37** 3735
[7] Ren Y, Huang H, Xie G, Ahmed N, Yan Y, Erkmen B I, Chandrasekaran N, Lavery M P J, Steinhoff N K, Tur M, Dolinar S, Neifeld M, Padgett M J, Boyd R W, Shapiro J H, Willner A E 2013 *Opt. Lett.* **38** 4062
[8] Ren Y, Xie G, Huang H, Bao C, Yan Y, Ahmed N, Lavery M P J, Erkmen B I, Dolinar S, Tur M, Neifeld M A, Padgett M J, Boyd R W, Shapiro J H, Willner A E 2014 *Opt. Lett.* **39** 2845
[9] Rodenburg B, Mirhosseini M, Malik M, Magaña-Loaiza O S, Yanakas M, Maher L, Steinhoff N K, Tyler G A, Boyd R W 2014 *New J. Phys.* **16** 033020
[10] Shapiro J H in Strohbehn J W, ed 1978 *Laser Beam Propagation in the Atmosphere* (Berlin: Springer-Verlag) Ch. 6
[11] Rodenburg B, 2014 private communication
[12] Lutomirski R F, Yura H T 1971 *Appl. Opt.* **10** 1652
[13] Ishimaru A *Wave Propagation and Scattering in Random Media, vol. 2* 1978 (New York, NY: Academic) Ch. 20